arXiv:1604.01606v2 [math.PR] 20 Nov 2016

DIFFERENTIAL SUBORDINATION UNDER CHANGE OF LAW

K. DOMELEVO AND S. PETERMICHL

Abstract. We prove optimal L^2 bounds for a pair of Hilbert space valued differentially subordinate martingales under a change of law. The change of law is given by a process called a weight and sharpness in this context refers to the optimal growth with respect to the characteristic of the weight. The pair of martingales are adapted, uniformly integrable, and càdlàg. Differential subordination is in the sense of Burkholder, defined through the use of the square bracket. In the scalar dyadic setting with underlying Lebesgue measure, this was proved by Wittwer [34], where homogeneity was heavily used. Recent progress by Thiele–Treil–Volberg [30] and Lacey [20], independently, resolved the so–called non–homogenous case using discrete in time filtrations, where one martingale is a predictable multiplier of the other. The general case for continuous–in–time filtrations and pairs of martingales that are not necessarily predictable multipliers, remained open and is adressed here. As a very useful by–product, we give the explicit expression of a Bellman function of four variables for the weighted estimate of subordinate martingales with jumps. This construction includes an analysis of the regularity of this function as well as a very precise convexity needed to deal with the jump part.

1. Introduction

The paper by Nazarov–Treil–Volberg [23] has set the groundwork for the early advances in modern weighted theory in harmonic analysis and probability that started around twenty years ago. In their paper the authors show necessary and sufficient conditions for a dyadic martingale transform to be bounded in the L^2 two–weight setting. The methodology of their proof could be used to get the first sharp result in the real valued one-weight setting, for the dyadic martingale transform

Partially supported by ERC grant CHRiSHarMa 682402. The second author is a member of IUF .

AMS 2010 classification: Primary 60G44; Secondary 60G46 .

[34]. Sharpness in this setting means best control on growth with the necessary A_2 condition

$$\sup_{\tau} \operatorname{ess}\,. \sup_{\omega} \mathbb{E}(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)$$

with τ adapted stopping times, where the dyadic filtration stands. Thus this becomes

$$\sup_{I} \left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int w\right)\left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int w^{-1}\right)$$

where the supremum runs over all dyadic intervals.

The area of sharp weighted estimates has seen substantial progress with new, beautiful proofs of Wittwer's result and its extensions to the time shifted martingales referred to as 'dyadic shift' [21][31]. Related, important questions in harmonic analysis, such as boundedness of the Beurling–Ahlfors transform [27], Hilbert transform [25], general Calderon-Zygmund operators [18][22][20] and beyond [5][18] have been solved, beautifully advancing profound understanding of the objects at hand.

During the early days of weighted theory in harmonic analysis, before optimal weighted estimates were within reach, say, for the maximal operator or the Hilbert transform [17] similar questions were asked in probability theory, concerning stochastic processes with continuous in time filtrations [6][19]. The difficulty that arises in the non–homogenous setting, typically seen when these processes have jumps, were already observed back then and this restriction was made in one form or another in these papers. Certain basic facts about weights do not hold true for jump processes, such as the classical self improvement of the A_2 characteristic of the weight [6]. Another obstacle typical for working with weights is the non-convexity of the set inspired by the A_2 characteristic: $\{r, s \in \mathbb{R}_+ : 1 \leqslant rs \leqslant Q\}$ with $Q > 1$. Such continuity–in–space assumptions still appear regularly for these or other reasons when adressing weights, see [3][24].

Wittwer's proof also uses the homogeneity that arises from the dyadic filtration where the underlying measure is Lebesgue in a subtle but crucial way. This homogeneity assumption has only recently been removed in the papers [30] and [20]. These authors work with discrete in time general filtrations with arbitrary underlying measure, where one martingale is a predictable multiplier of the other. A direct passage using the results for discrete in time filtrations to the continuous in

time filtration case where one uses Burkholder's definition

$$\begin{aligned} & Y \text{ differentially subordinate to } X \\ :\Leftrightarrow \quad & [X,X]_t - [Y,Y]_t \text{ nonnegative and nondecreasing} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

is only possible in very special cases, such as predictable multipliers of stochastic integrals - this passage is explained in one of Burkholder's early works on L^p estimates for pairs of differentially subordinate martingales [7]. (In full generality, this unweighted L^p problem was only much later resolved in [33].)

In this article, we tackle the sharp weighted estimate in full generality, using the notion of differentail subordination of Burkholder (1) and the martingale A_2 characteristic,

$$Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w] = \sup_{\tau} \operatorname{ess}.\sup_{\omega} (w)_\tau (w^{-1})_\tau.$$

We prove that for L^2 integrable Hilbert space valued martingales Y, X with Y differentially subordinate to X there holds

$$\|Y\|_{L^2(w)} \lesssim Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w] \|X\|_{L^2(w)}$$

where the implied constant is numeric and does not depend upon the dimension, the pair of martingales or the weight. The linear growth in the quantity $Q_2(w)$ is sharp.

The proof in this paper is different from the proofs in [20] and [30]. In [20] so–called sparse operators are used while in [30] the authors reduce the estimate through the use of so–called outer measure space theory.

Our approach is the following. We derive an explicit Bellman function of four variables adapted to the problem. It has certain conditions on its range, a continuous sub–convexity as well as discrete one–leg convexity, such as seen in [30] for two smaller Bellman functions (their functions make up a part of ours). We heavily use the explicit form of our Bellman function and its regularity properties in several parts in our proof to handle the delicacy of the continuous–in–time processes with values in Hilbert space. The resulting function is in the 'dualized' or 'weak form', which is in a contrast to the 'strong form' of a Burkholder type functional often seen when using the strong subordination condition (1). (The explicit form of a Burkholder type functional for this weighted question is still open). Indeed, the form of the strong differential subordination condition is adapted to work well for Burkholder type functionals and arises naturally in this setting. The passage to its use in the weak form is accomplished through the use of the so–called

Ellipse Lemma and requires a Bellman function solving the entire problem at once as opposed to splitting the problem into pieces. This is the first use of this strategy for problems in probability and should allow generalisations of numerous existing results as well as an alternative (allbeit more complicated) proof of Wang's extension to Burkholder's famous estimates using [32] or [2]. Note that for these L^p problems, fewer difficulties arise, even in the presence of jumps. This is thanks to the convexity of the domain in the L^p problem. The discrete convexity required to control the jumps is almost free, when using a trick from [11]. This trick is not available here because of the non–convex domain.

Our result gives through the formula in [4] a probabilistic proof of the weighted estimate for the Beurling–Ahlfors transform with its implication, a famous borderline regularity problem for the Beltrami equation, solved in [27]. Other applications are discussed in the last section. They include a dimensionless weighted bound for discrete and semi-discrete second order Riesz transforms.

1.1. **Differentially subordinate martingales.**

Consider first discrete–in–time martingales. For that let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$ a probability space with a nondecreasing sequence $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ of sub σ–fields of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ such that $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all $\mathcal{F}_\infty$–null sets. We are interested in $\mathbb{H}$–valued martingales, where $\mathbb{H}$ is a separable Hilbert space with norm $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{H}}$ and scalar product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}$: if $f = \{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a $\mathbb{H}$–valued martingale adapted to $\mathcal{F}$, we note $f_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \mathrm{d}f_k$, with the convention $\mathrm{d}f_0 := f_0$, and $\mathrm{d}f_k := f_k - f_{k-1}$, for $k \geqslant 1$. Similarily, if g is another adapted $\mathbb{H}$–valued martingale, we note $g_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \mathrm{d}g_k$ with the same conventions. One says that g is differentially subordinate to f if one has for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $k \geqslant 0$, $|\mathrm{d}g_k|_{\mathbb{H}} \leqslant |\mathrm{d}f_k|_{\mathbb{H}}$.

In this paper we consider continuous–in–time filtrations. Let again $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$ a probability space with a nondecreasing right continuous family $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ of sub σ–fields of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ such that $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all $\mathcal{F}_\infty$–null sets. We are interested in $\mathbb{H}$–valued càdlàg martingales, where $\mathbb{H}$ is a separable Hilbert space. In order to clearly define differential subordination in this setting, we make use of the square bracket or quadratic variation process.

Recall that the quadratic variation process of a semimartingale X is the process denoted by $[X, X] := ([X, X]_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ and defined as (see e.g.

Protter [28])

$$[X,X]_t = X_t^2 - 2\int_0^t X_{s-}\mathrm{d}X_s$$

where we have set $X_{0-} = 0$. Similarily, the quadratic covariation of two semimartingales X and Y is the following process also known as the bracket process

$$[X,Y]_t := X_tY_t - \int_0^t X_{s-}\mathrm{d}Y_s - \int Y_{s-}\mathrm{d}X_s.$$

Definition 1 (differential subordination)**.** *Let X and Y two adapted càdlàg semimartingales taking values in a separable Hilbert space. We say Y is differentially subordinate by quadratic variation to X iff*

$$[X,X]_t - [Y,Y]_t$$

is a nondecreasing and nonnegative function of $t \geqslant 0$.

Let us denote by X^c the unique continuous part of X with

$$[X,X]_t = |X_0|^2 + [X^c,X^c]_t + \sum_{0<s\leqslant t} |\Delta X_s|^2.$$

There holds $[X,X]_t^c = [X^c,X^c]_t$ and $\Delta[X,X]_t = |\Delta X_t|^2$ where $\Delta X_t := X_t - X_{t-}$. We have the following obvious characterisation distinguishing the continuous and jump parts:

Lemma 1. *If X and Y are semimartingales, then Y is differentially subordinate to X if and only if (i) $[X,X]_t^c - [Y,Y]_t^c$ is a nonnegative and nondecreasing function of t, (ii) the inequality $|\Delta Y_t| \leqslant |\Delta X_t|$ holds for all $t > 0$ and (iii) $|Y_0| \leqslant |X_0|$.*

1.2. **Martingales in non–homogeneous weighted spaces.**

Let again $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$ a probability space with a nondecreasing right continuous family $\mathcal{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ of sub σ–fields of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ such that $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all $\mathcal{F}_\infty$–null sets. The measure $\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}$ is arbitrary (up to the obvious normalisation). If X and Y are adapted càdlàg square integrable $\mathbb{H}$–valued martingales and Y is differentially subordinate to X, then it is obvious that

$$\|Y\|_2 \leqslant \|X\|_2. \tag{2}$$

Recall here that $\|X\|_2 := \sup_t \|X_t\|_2$, where

$$\|X_t\|_2^2 := \mathbb{E}|X_t|^2 = \int_\Omega |X_t(\omega)|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(\omega). \tag{3}$$

Assume again that Y is differentially subordinate to X. We might insist on the underlying probability space at hand by saying in short that X and Y are $\mathbb{P}$–martingales and that Y is $\mathbb{P}$–differentially–subordinate to X. The main concern of this paper is to obtain sharp inequalities similar to (2) under a change of law in the definition of the L^2–norm according to [9]. Let w be a positive, uniformy integrable martingale (that we often identify with its closure w_∞) that we call a weight. Let $\mathrm{d}\mathbb{Q} := \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}^w := w\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathbb{Q})$ be a probability space with the same assumptions as $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$ but with a change of the probability law.

Question 1. *Let $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ such that $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathbb{Q})$ are two filtered probability spaces as described above. Does there exist a constant $C_{\mathbb{P},\mathbb{Q}} > 0$ depending only on $(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q})$ such that if X and Y are uniformly integrable $\mathbb{P}$–martingales adapted to $\mathcal{F}$ and Y is $\mathbb{P}$–differentially–subordinate to X, then*

$$\|Y\|_{2,\mathbb{Q}} \leqslant C_{\mathbb{P},\mathbb{Q}} \|X\|_{2,\mathbb{Q}}.$$

We look for $C_{\mathbb{P},\mathbb{Q}} := C_w$ allowing to compare $\|Y\|_{2,\mathbb{Q}} := \|Y\|_{2,w}$ and $\|X\|_{2,\mathbb{Q}} := \|X\|_{2,w}$. We will need also $u = w^{-1}$ the inverse weight and we assume u uniformly integrable. We will finally note $\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}^u := u\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}$. It follows that $\mathbb{P}^w$ and $\mathbb{P}^u$ are probability measures on Ω up to the obvious normalisations. The necessary condition on the weight is classical:

Definition 2 (A_2 class)**.** *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}, \mathbb{P})$ a filtered probability space. We say that the weight $w > 0$ is in the A_2–class, iff the A_2–characteristic of the weight w, noted $Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]$ and defined as*

$$Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w] := \sup_\tau \operatorname{ess}. \sup_\omega (w)_\tau (w^{-1})_\tau$$

with the first supremum running over all adapted stopping times, is finite.

We often write $Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w] := \sup_\tau \operatorname{ess}. \sup_\omega w_\tau u_\tau$ where $u := w^{-1}$ is the inverse weight.

2. Statement of the main results

Theorem 1 (differential subordination under change of law)**.** *Let X and Y be two adapted uniformly integrable càdlàg $\mathbb{H}$–valued martingales such that Y is differentially subordinate to X. Let w be an admissible weight in the $\boldsymbol{A}_2$ class. Then*

$$\|Y\|_{L^2(w)} \lesssim Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w] \|X\|_{L^2(w)}$$

and the linear growth in $Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]$ is sharp.

This result will be a consequence of the following bilinear estimate:

Proposition 1 (bilinear estimate)**.** *Let X and Y be two adapted uniformly integrable càdlàg $\mathbb{H}$–valued martingales such that Y is differentially subordinate to X. Let w an admissible weight in the $\boldsymbol{A}_2$ class. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^\infty |\mathrm{d}[Y,Z]_t| \lesssim Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]\|X\|_w\|Z\|_u.$$

We have an explicit expression of the function described below. This is, aside from Theorem 1, one of the main results of this paper. Let us note V the quadruplet

$$V := (x,y,r,s) \in \mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}_+^*\times\mathbb{R}_+^* =: \mathbb{S}.$$

The variables (x,y) will be associated to $\mathbb{H}$–valued martingales whereas the variables (r,s) to $\mathbb{R}$–valued martingales for the weights. We introduce $\mathcal{D}_Q$ the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_Q := \left\{V\in\mathbb{S}: \quad 1\leqslant rs\leqslant Q\right\}.$$

We will often restrict our attention to truncated weights, that is given $0<\varepsilon<1$, variables (r,s) bounded below and above

$$\mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon := \left\{V\in\mathcal{D}_Q: \quad \varepsilon\leqslant r\leqslant\varepsilon^{-1}, \quad \varepsilon\leqslant s\leqslant\varepsilon^{-1}\right\}.$$

Lemma 2 (existence and properties of the Bellman function)**.** *There exists a function $B(V)=B_Q$ that is $\mathcal{C}^1$ on $\mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon$, and piecewise $\mathcal{C}^2$, with the estimate*

$$B(V)\lesssim\frac{|x|^2}{r}+\frac{|y|^2}{s}$$

and on each subdomain where it is $\mathcal{C}^2$ there holds

$$\mathrm{d}^2B\geqslant\frac{2}{Q}|\mathrm{d}x||\mathrm{d}y|.$$

Whenever V and V_0 are in the domain, the function has the property

$$B(V)-B(V_0)-\mathrm{d}B(V_0)(V-V_0)\geqslant\frac{2}{Q}|x-x_0||y-y_0|.$$

Moreover, we have the estimates

$$|(\partial_x^2B\mathrm{d}x,\mathrm{d}x)|\lesssim\varepsilon^{-1}|\mathrm{d}x|^2, \qquad |(\partial_y^2B\mathrm{d}y,\mathrm{d}y)|\lesssim\varepsilon^{-1}|\mathrm{d}y|^2$$

with the implied constants independent of V and $(\mathrm{d}x,\mathrm{d}y)$.

3. Existence and properties of the Bellman function

Proof of Lemma 2 (existence and properties of the Bellman function)

We give an explicit expression for such a function. Let $V = (x, y, r, s)$ and $W = (r, s)$. We first consider

$$B_1(x, y, r, s) = \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{r} + \frac{\langle y, y\rangle}{s}.$$

Then trivially $0 \leqslant B_1 \leqslant \frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{r} + \frac{\langle y,y\rangle}{s}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathrm{d}^2 B_1 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) &= \frac{2}{r}\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle + \frac{2\langle x, x\rangle}{r^3}(\mathrm{d}r)^2 - 4\frac{\langle x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle}{r^2}\mathrm{d}r \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{s}\langle \mathrm{d}y, \mathrm{d}y\rangle + \frac{2\langle y, y\rangle}{s^3}(\mathrm{d}s)^2 - 4\frac{\langle y, \mathrm{d}y\rangle}{s^2}\mathrm{d}s \\
&= \frac{2}{r}\left\langle \mathrm{d}x - \frac{x}{r}\mathrm{d}r, \mathrm{d}x - \frac{x}{r}\mathrm{d}r\right\rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{s}\left\langle \mathrm{d}y - \frac{y}{s}\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}y - \frac{y}{s}\mathrm{d}s\right\rangle \\
&\geqslant 0
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $V_0 = (x_0, y_0, r_0, s_0)$ and $V = (x, y, r, s)$ also calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&-(B_1(V_0) - B_1(V) + \mathrm{d}B_1(V_0)(V - V_0)) \\
= &-\left(\frac{x_0^2}{r_0} - \frac{x^2}{r} + \frac{2x_0}{r_0}(x - x_0) - \frac{x_0^2}{r_0^2}(r - r_0)\right) \\
&-\left(\frac{y_0^2}{s_0} - \frac{y^2}{s} + \frac{2y_0}{s_0}(y - y_0) - \frac{y_0^2}{s_0^2}(s - s_0)\right) \\
= &\; r\left\langle \frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}, \frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}\right\rangle + s\left\langle \frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}, \frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}\right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

We now consider the two functions from [30]

$$K(r, s) = \frac{\sqrt{rs}}{\sqrt{Q}}\left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{rs}}{8\sqrt{Q}}\right)$$

$$N(r, s) = \frac{\sqrt{rs}}{\sqrt{Q}}\left(1 - \frac{(rs)^2}{128Q^2}\right)$$

in the domain $1 \leqslant rs \leqslant Q$. We have

$$0 \leqslant K \leqslant \left(1 - \frac{1}{8\sqrt{Q}}\right)\frac{\sqrt{rs}}{\sqrt{Q}} < \frac{\sqrt{rs}}{\sqrt{Q}} \leqslant 1,$$

$$0 \leqslant N \leqslant \left(1 - \frac{1}{128Q^2}\right)\frac{\sqrt{rs}}{\sqrt{Q}} < \frac{\sqrt{rs}}{\sqrt{Q}} \leqslant 1.$$

So in particular $rs \geqslant rs - K^2 > rs\left(1 - \frac{1}{Q}\right)$. One calculates that

$$-(\mathrm{d}^2 K \mathrm{d}W, \mathrm{d}W) \geqslant \frac{1}{8Q}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s|,$$

$$-(\mathrm{d}^2 N \mathrm{d}W, \mathrm{d}W) \gtrsim \frac{1}{Q^2} s^2 (\mathrm{d}r)^2,$$

$$-(\mathrm{d}^2 N \mathrm{d}W, \mathrm{d}W) \gtrsim \frac{1}{Q^2} r^2 (\mathrm{d}s)^2.$$

One also has whenever W, W_0 in the domain then

$$K(W_0) - K(W) + \mathrm{d}K(W_0)(W - W_0) \gtrsim \frac{1}{Q}|r - r_0||s - s_0|,$$

$$N(W_0) - N(W) + \mathrm{d}N(W_0)(W - W_0) \gtrsim \frac{1}{Q^2} s_0 s |r - r_0|^2,$$

$$N(W_0) - N(W) + \mathrm{d}N(W_0)(W - W_0) \gtrsim \frac{1}{Q^2} r_0 r |s - s_0|^2.$$

These remarkable one-leg concavity properties were proven in [30].

Let now

$$B_2 = \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{2r - \frac{1}{s(N(r,s)+1)}} + \frac{\langle y, y\rangle}{s} = \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{r + M(r,s)} + \frac{\langle y, y\rangle}{s},$$

where

$$M(r,s) = r - \frac{1}{s(N(r,s)+1)}.$$

One checks easily by calculation of their Hessians that

$$F(x, r, M) = \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{r + M},$$

$$G(r, s, N) = \frac{1}{s(N+1)}$$

are convex everywhere. In order to estimate the Hessian of B_2 from below, one merely requires estimates of derivatives

$$-\partial_M F = \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{(r+M)^2} \geqslant \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{4r^2} \text{ and } -\partial_N G = \frac{1}{s(N+1)^2} \geqslant \frac{1}{4s}.$$

Since $0 \leqslant r - \frac{1}{s(N(r,s)+1)} \leqslant r$ we know $0 \leqslant B_2 \leqslant \frac{|x|^2}{r} + \frac{|y|^2}{s}$. Now the Hessian estimate becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{d}^2 B_2 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \\ \gtrsim & \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{4r^2} \frac{1}{s(N+1)^2} \frac{1}{Q^2} |\mathrm{d}r|^2 s^2 + \frac{2}{s} \left\langle \mathrm{d}y - \frac{y}{s}\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}y - \frac{y}{s}\mathrm{d}s \right\rangle \\ \gtrsim & \frac{|x|^2 s}{Q^2 r^2} |\mathrm{d}r|^2 + \frac{2}{s} \left\langle \mathrm{d}y - \frac{y}{s}\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}y - \frac{y}{s}\mathrm{d}s \right\rangle \\ \gtrsim & \frac{|x|}{Q} |\mathrm{d}r| \left| \mathrm{d}y - \frac{y}{s}\mathrm{d}s \right|. \end{aligned}$$

This function has the additional property

$$\begin{aligned} & -(B_2(V_0) - B_2(V) + \mathrm{d}B_2(V_0)(V - V_0)) \\ \gtrsim & \frac{\langle x_0, x_0\rangle}{Q^2 r_0^2} s(r - r_0)^2 + s \left\langle \frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}, \frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, write

$$\frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{2r - \frac{1}{s(N(r,s)+1)}} = H(x, r, s, N(r, s)) \text{ with } H(x, r, s, N) = \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{2r - \frac{1}{s(N+1)}}$$

where H is convex and

$$-\partial_N H \gtrsim \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{Q^2 r^2 s}.$$

Now since H is convex we have with $P_0 = (x_0, r_0, s_0, N_0)$ and with $P = (x, r, s, N)$ that $H(P) \geqslant H(P_0) + \mathrm{d}H(P - P_0)$. So

$$\begin{aligned} & H(P) - H(P_0) \\ & \quad -\partial_x H(P_0)(x - x_0) - \partial_r H(P_0)(r - r_0) - \partial_s H(P_0)(s - s_0) \\ \geqslant & -\partial_N H(P_0)(N_0 - N). \end{aligned}$$

With

$$\begin{aligned} & N(r_0, s_0) - N(r, s) + \partial_r N(r_0, s_0)(r - r_0) + \partial_s N(r_0, s_0)(s - s_0) \\ \gtrsim & \frac{1}{Q^2} r_0 r |s - s_0|^2 \end{aligned}$$

the above becomes with $N_0 = N(r_0, s_0)$ and $N = N(r, s)$

$$\begin{aligned} & B_2(V) - B_2(V_0) - \mathrm{d}B_2(V_0)(V - V_0) \\ \gtrsim & \frac{\langle x_0, x_0\rangle}{Q^2 r_0^2} s|r - r_0|^2 + s \left\langle \frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}, \frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0} \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where we used the lower derivative estimate and the chain rule. Analogously

$$B_3 = \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{r} + \frac{\langle y, y\rangle}{2s - \frac{1}{r(N(r,s)+1)}}$$

has the same size estimates as well as

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_3 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \gtrsim \frac{|y|}{Q}|\mathrm{d}s| \left|\mathrm{d}x - \frac{x}{r}\mathrm{d}r\right|$$

and one–leg convexity

$$\begin{aligned} & B_3(V) - B_3(V_0) - \mathrm{d}B_3(V_0)(V - V_0) \\ \gtrsim\ & \frac{\langle y_0, y_0\rangle}{Q^2 s_0^2} r|s - s_0|^2 + r\left\langle \frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}, \frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}\right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider

$$H_4(x, y, r, s, K) = \sup_{0<a} \beta(a, x, y, r, s, K) = \sup_{0<a}\left(\frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{r + aK} + \frac{\langle y, y\rangle}{s + a^{-1}K}\right).$$

Testing for critical points gives

$$\partial_a \beta = -\frac{\langle x, x\rangle K}{(r + aK)^2} + \frac{\langle y, y\rangle K}{(as + K)^2}.$$

So $\partial_a \beta = 0$ if and only if

$$a = a' = \frac{|y|r - |x|K}{|x|s - |y|K}.$$

Since only $a > 0$ are admissible, we require that $|y|r - |x|K$ and $|x|s - |y|K$ have the same sign. To determine sign change of $\partial_a \beta$ at a', Consider

$$-\frac{|x|}{r + aK} + \frac{|y|}{as + K} = \frac{(|y|r - |x|K) - a(|x|s - |y|K)}{(r + aK)(as + K)}.$$

If the signs are negative, then the sign change is from negative to positive otherwise from positive the negative. For a maximum to be attained at $a' > 0$ we require that both numerator and denominator be positive. Then, if K is relatively small, meaning $|y|r - |x|K$ and

$|x|s-|y|K$ positive we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_4(x,y,r,s,K) &= \beta(a',x,y,r,s) \\ &= \frac{\langle x,x\rangle(|x|s-|y|K)}{r(|x|s-|y|K)+(|y|r-|x|K)K} \\ &\quad +\frac{\langle y,y\rangle(|y|r-|x|K)}{s(|y|r-|x|K)+(|x|s-|y|K)K} \\ &= \frac{\langle x,x\rangle s-2|x||y|K+\langle y,y\rangle r}{rs-K^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that by the above considerations on K, the denominator is never 0. The case $|x|=0$ or $|y|=0$ corresponds to other parts of the domain, so when K is small in the sense above, this function is in $\mathcal{C}^2$.

When $|y|r-|x|K\leqslant 0$ or $|x|s-|y|K\leqslant 0$, the supremum is attained at the boundary and $H_4=\frac{\langle y,y\rangle}{s}$ or $H_4=\frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{r}$. Thanks to the size restrictions on K we never have both $|x|s-|y|K\leqslant 0$ and $|y|r-|x|K\leqslant 0$ unless $x,y=0$, indeed

$$\begin{aligned} & |x|(|x|s-|y|K)+|y|(|y|r-|x|K) \\ = \ & \frac{|x|^2}{r}-2\frac{|x||y|}{rs}K+\frac{|y|^2}{s} \\ = \ & \left(\frac{|x|}{\sqrt{r}}-\frac{|y|}{\sqrt{s}}\right)^2+\frac{2|x||y|}{\sqrt{rs}}\left(1-\frac{K}{\sqrt{rs}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

With $1-\frac{K}{\sqrt{rs}}>0$ we see that the above is never negative and the quantity vanishing implies $x=y=0$. If $|x|s-|y|K\leqslant 0$ and $|y|r-|x|K>0$ then $\frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{r}<\frac{\langle y,y\rangle}{s}$ and $H_4=\frac{\langle y,y\rangle}{s}$, if $|y|r-|x|K\leqslant 0$ and $|x|s-|y|K>0$ then $H_4=\frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{r}$.

Notice that when $\frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{r}=\frac{\langle y,y\rangle}{s}$ and $x,y\neq 0$ then $|y|r-|x|K>0$ and $|x|s-|y|K>0$. Indeed, we have seen $\frac{|x|^2}{r}-2\frac{|x||y|}{rs}K+\frac{|y|^2}{s}>0$. Thus $\frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{r}=\frac{\langle y,y\rangle}{s}>\frac{|x||y|}{rs}K$ and $|y|r-|x|K>0$ and $|x|s-|y|K>0$.

Thus $H_4\in\mathcal{C}^2$ for these parts of the domain. We also see from these considerations that in order to see $H_4\in\mathcal{C}^1$ we only need to check the cuts $|x|s-|y|K=0$ and $|y|r-|x|K\geqslant 0$ as well as $|y|r-|x|K=0$ and $|x|s-|y|K\geqslant 0$.

When $|y|r-|x|K>0$ and $|x|s-|y|K>0$ (we call this part of the domain R_1)

$$(\partial_x H_4,\mathrm{d}x)=2\frac{\langle dx,x\rangle}{|x|}\frac{|x|s-|y|K}{rs-K^2}$$

$$\partial_r H_4=-\frac{(|x|s-|y|K)^2}{(rs-K^2)^2}$$

$$\partial_K H_4 = -2\frac{(|x|s-|y|K)(|y|r-|x|K)}{(rs-K^2)^2}$$

We first prove that $\partial_x H_4$ is continuous throughout. Recall that we have to treat three regions: R_1 and R_2 where $|y|r-|x|K>0$ and $|x|s-|y|K\leqslant 0$ and R_3 where $|x|s-|y|K\leqslant 0$ and $|y|r-|x|K>0$. Inside R_2 we have $H_4=\frac{\langle y,y\rangle}{s}$ and thus $\partial_x H_4=0$. Inside R_3 we have $H_4=\frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{r}$ and thus $\partial_x H_4=\frac{2\langle x,dx\rangle}{r}$. Inside R_1

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_x H_4 &= 2\frac{\langle \mathrm{d}x,x\rangle}{|x|}\frac{|x|s-|y|K}{rs-K^2}\\ &= 2\langle x,\mathrm{d}x\rangle\frac{|x|s-|y|K}{r(|x|s-|y|K)+(|y|r-|x|K)K}.\end{aligned}$$

We have three cases, first, let us approach a boundary point of R_1 from within R_1 so that $|y|r-|x|K>0$ and $|x|s-|y|K=0$. Assume therefore $|y|r-|x|K\sim a>0$ and $0<|x|s-|y|K<\varepsilon$. There holds $|\langle\partial_x H_4,\mathrm{d}x\rangle|\leqslant 2|\mathrm{d}x|\frac{\varepsilon}{rs-K^2}\lesssim\varepsilon|\mathrm{d}x|$ since $rs-K^2$ is bounded below. Letting $\varepsilon\to 0$ shows continuity in this point. Second, let us approach a boundary point $|x|s-|y|K>0$ and $|y|r-|x|K=0$ from within R_1. Assume therefore $|x|s-|y|K\sim a>0$ and $0<|y|r-|x|K<\varepsilon$. We show there holds $(\partial_x H_4,dx)\lesssim\frac{\varepsilon}{a}|\mathrm{d}x|$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{r}-(|y|r-|x|K)K\frac{|x|s-|y|K}{r^2(|x|s-|y|K)^2}\\ \leqslant\ &\frac{(|x|s-|y|K)}{r(|x|s-|y|K)+(|y|r-|x|K)K}\\ \leqslant\ &\frac{1}{r}\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{2\langle x,\mathrm{d}x\rangle(|x|s-|y|K)}{r(|x|s-|y|K)+(|y|r-|x|K)K}-\frac{2\langle x,\mathrm{d}x\rangle}{r}\right|\\ \leqslant\ &2|\langle x,\mathrm{d}x\rangle|\frac{(|y|r-|x|K)K}{r^2(|x|s-|y|K)}\\ \lesssim\ &|x||\mathrm{d}x|\frac{\varepsilon}{a}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $0<|y|r-|x|K<\varepsilon$ and s,r,K controlled, one can deduce from $|x|s-|y|K\sim a$ that $|x|\sim a$. Last, let us approach $|y|r-|x|K=0$ and $|x|s-|y|K=0$. To this end, one can see that if $0<|y|r-|x|K<\varepsilon$ and $0<|x|s-|y|K<\varepsilon$ then $|x|,|y|\lesssim\varepsilon$, establishing continuity in the third case.

The $\partial_r H_4$ derivative is similar since the term $\frac{|x|s-|y|K}{rs-K^2}$ reappears as a square and in R_3 notice that $H_4 = \frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{r}$ so $\partial_r H_4 = -\frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{r^2}$. It is easy to see that the derivative $\partial_K H_4$ is zero in R_2 and R_3 as well as when approaching the boundary of R_1.

These derivatives are representative by symmetry and the function is therefore in $\mathcal{C}^1$. As a consequence

$$B_4(X,Y,x,y,r,s) = H_4(x,y,r,s,K(r,s)) \in \mathcal{C}^1.$$

Function B_4 is as supremum of convex functions convex. It has been shown indirectly in [23] that $-\partial_K B_4 \geqslant 0$ everywhere and that in $R_1' \subset R_1$ where $|y|r-2|x|K > 0$ and $|x|s-2|y|K > 0$ we have $-\partial_K B_4 \gtrsim \frac{|x||y|}{rs}$. We present an easier argument. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\partial_K B_4 \\ = \; & 2\frac{(|x|s-|y|K)(|y|r-|x|K)}{(rs-K^2)^2} \\ = \; & 2\frac{(|x|s-|y|K)(|y|r-|x|K)|x||y|}{(r(|x|s-|y|K)+K(|y|r-|x|K))(s(|y|r-|x|K)+K(|x|s-|y|K))} \end{aligned}$$

So $-\partial_K B_4 \geqslant c\frac{|x||y|}{rs}$ if

$$\frac{rs}{c} \geqslant K^2 + rs + \frac{Kr(|x|s-|y|K)}{|y|r-|x|K} + \frac{Ks(|y|r-|x|K)}{|x|s-|y|K}.$$

Now $K^2 \leqslant 1 \leqslant rs$ and when $|y|r-2|x|K \geqslant 0$ then $|y|r-|x|K \geqslant |x|K$. Similarly $|x|s-|y|K \geqslant |y|K$. So the last two terms are bounded by $\frac{Kr|x|s}{|x|K} + \frac{Ks|y|r}{|y|K} = 2rs$. So $c = 1/4$ works. In R_1'

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_4 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant 4\frac{|x||y|}{8rsQ}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s| = \frac{|x||y|}{2rsQ}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s|.$$

We need to add more functions with the good concavity for other K. Let

$$B_5 = \frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{2r - \frac{1}{s(K(r,s)+1)}} + \frac{\langle y,y\rangle}{s}.$$

Since $0 \leqslant r - \frac{1}{s(K(r,s)+1)} \leqslant r$ we know $0 \leqslant B_5 \leqslant \frac{|x|^2}{r} + \frac{|y|^2}{s}$. Now the Hessian estimate becomes

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_5 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant \frac{\langle x,x\rangle}{4r^2}\frac{1}{s(K+1)^2}\frac{1}{8Q}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s| \geqslant \frac{|x|^2}{128Qsr^2}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s|.$$

B_5 convex and when $2|x|K \geqslant |y|r$ then

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_5 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant \frac{|x||y|}{256KQsr}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s| \geqslant \frac{|x||y|}{256Qsr}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s|.$$

With

$$B_6 = \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{r} + \frac{\langle y, y\rangle}{2s - \frac{1}{r(K(r,s)+1)}}$$

we have $0 \leqslant B_6 \leqslant \frac{|x|^2}{r} + \frac{|y|^2}{s}$ convex and when $2|y|K \geqslant |x|s$ then

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_6 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant \frac{|x||y|}{256Qsr}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s|.$$

Together, we have for $B_7 = B_4 + B_5 + B_6$ that

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_7 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \gtrsim \frac{|x||y|}{Qsr}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s|.$$

Through similar considerations as above, we have discrete one-leg convexity

$$B_7(V) - B_7(V_0) - \mathrm{d}B_7(V_0)(V - V_0) \gtrsim \frac{|x_0||y_0|}{Qs_0r_0}|r - r_0||s - s_0|.$$

Letting for appropriate fixed c_i

$$B = c_1B_1 + c_2B_2 + c_3B_3 + c_7B_7 \tag{4}$$

we obtain $0 \leqslant B \lesssim \frac{|x|^2}{r} + \frac{|y|^2}{s}$ and $\mathrm{d}^2 B \geqslant \frac{2}{Q}|\mathrm{d}x||\mathrm{d}y|$ in the regions where $B \in \mathcal{C}^2$. Indeed,

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_1 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant \frac{4}{Q}|\mathrm{d}x||\mathrm{d}y| + \frac{4|x||y|}{Qrs}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s| - \frac{4|y|}{Qs}|\mathrm{d}x||\mathrm{d}s| - \frac{4|x|}{Qr}|\mathrm{d}y||\mathrm{d}r|$$

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_2 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{3}|x|}{2Qr}|\mathrm{d}y||\mathrm{d}r| - \frac{\sqrt{3}|y|}{2Qrs}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s|$$

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_3 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{3}|y|}{2Qs}|\mathrm{d}x||\mathrm{d}s| - \frac{\sqrt{3}|x|}{2Qrs}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s|$$

$$(\mathrm{d}^2 B_7 \mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant \frac{|x||y|}{256Qrs}|\mathrm{d}r||\mathrm{d}s|$$

where the last inequality holds in the regions where the function $B_4 \in \mathcal{C}^2$. The weighted sum of these inequalities according to 4 yields the desired inequality on convexity. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} &B_1(V) - B_1(V_0) - \mathrm{d}B_1(V_0)(V - V_0) \\ \gtrsim\ & \frac{rs}{Q}\left|\frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}\right|\left|\frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}\right| \geqslant \frac{rs}{Q}\left|\left\langle \frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}, \frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}\right\rangle\right|, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &B_2(V) - B_2(V_0) - \mathrm{d}B_2(V_0)(V - V_0) \\ \gtrsim\ & \frac{s}{Q}\frac{|x_0|}{r_0}|r - r_0|\left|\frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}\right| \geqslant \frac{s}{Q}\left|\left\langle \frac{x_0}{r_0}, \frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}\right\rangle\right||r - r_0|, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & B_3(V) - B_3(V_0) - \mathrm{d}B_3(V_0)(V - V_0) \\ \gtrsim\ & \frac{r}{Q}\frac{|y_0|}{s_0}|s - s_0|\left|\frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}\right| \geqslant \frac{r}{Q}\left|\left\langle \frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}, \frac{y_0}{s_0}\right\rangle\right| |s - s_0|, \\ & B_7(V) - B_7(V_0) - \mathrm{d}B_7(V_0)(V - V_0) \\ \gtrsim\ & \frac{1}{Q}|x_0||y_0||r - r_0||s - s_0| \geqslant \frac{1}{Q}|\langle x_0, y_0\rangle||r - r_0||s - s_0|. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the last inequalities also remain true when we replace x by Θx and x_0 by Θx_0 where the rotation Θ is chosen so that $\Theta(x - x_0)$ and $y - y_0$ have the same direction and thus we may assume that $\langle x - x_0, y - y_0\rangle = |x - x_0||y - y_0|$.

Summing the above inequalities gives

$$\begin{aligned} & Q(B(V) - B(V_0) - \mathrm{d}B(V_0)(V - V_0)) \\ \gtrsim\ & \left\langle \left(\frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}\right) r, \left(\frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}\right) s + \frac{y_0}{s_0}(s - s_0)\right\rangle \\ & \quad + \left\langle \frac{x_0}{r_0}(r - r_0), \left(\frac{y}{s} - \frac{y_0}{s_0}\right) s + \frac{y_0}{s_0}(s - s_0)\right\rangle \\ =\ & \left\langle \left(\frac{x}{r} - \frac{x_0}{r_0}\right) r, y - y_0\right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{x_0}{r_0}(r - r_0), y - y_0\right\rangle \\ =\ & \langle x - x_0, y - y_0\rangle = |x - x_0||y - y_0| \end{aligned}$$

and we have proved the one-leg convexity. It remains to bound the second derivatives in x and y. Let ε be the cut off of the weights so that $\varepsilon \leqslant r, s \leqslant \varepsilon^{-1}$. We calculate

$$\left(\partial_x^2 \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{r}\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\right) = \frac{2\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle}{r} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle;$$

$$\left(\partial_x^2 \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{r + M(r,s)}\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\right) = \frac{2\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle}{r + M(r,s)} \leqslant \frac{2\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle}{r} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle;$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\partial_x^2 \frac{\langle x, x\rangle s - 2|x||y|K + \langle y, y\rangle r}{rs - K^2}\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\right) \\ =\ & \frac{2\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle s}{rs - K^2} - \frac{2|y|K}{rs - K^2}\left(\frac{\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle}{|x|} - \frac{\langle x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle^2}{|x|^3}\right) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where the last implied constant uses the lower bound for $rs - K^2 > rs\left(1 - \frac{1}{Q}\right) \geqslant 1 - \frac{1}{Q}$. We used that $\langle x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle^2 \leqslant \langle x, x\rangle\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle \Rightarrow \frac{\langle \mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle}{|x|} - \frac{\langle x, \mathrm{d}x\rangle^2}{|x|^3} \geqslant 0$.

These imply that for $V \in \mathcal{D}_{Q,\varepsilon}$

$$(\partial_x^2 B(V)\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}|\mathrm{d}x|^2. \tag{5}$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 2. □

Convexities of the form $\mathrm{d}^2 B(V) \geqslant 2|\mathrm{d}x||\mathrm{d}y|$ can be self improved using the following interesting lemma:

Lemma 3. *(ellipse lemma,* Dragicevic–Treil–Volberg [14]*) Let* $\mathbb{H}$ *be a Hilbert space with* A, B *two positive definite operators on* $\mathbb{H}$*. Let* T *be a self-adjoint operator on* $\mathbb{H}$ *such that*

$$(Th, h) \geqslant 2(Ah, h)^{1/2}(Bh, h)^{1/2}$$

for all $h \in \mathbb{H}$*. Then there exists* $\tau > 0$ *satisfying*

$$(Th, h) \geqslant \tau(Ah, h) + \tau^{-1}(Bh, h)$$

for all $h \in \mathbb{H}$*.*

For our specific Bellman function, we will need a quantitative version:

Lemma 4 (quantitative ellipse lemma for B)**.** *Let* $V \in \mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon$*. Assume moreover that* B *is* $\mathcal{C}^2$ *at* V*. Then there exists* $\tau(V) > 0$ *such that*

$$Q\mathrm{d}_V^2 B(V) \geqslant \tau(V)|\mathrm{d}x|^2 + (\tau(V))^{-1}|\mathrm{d}y|^2.$$

Moreover, we have the bound

$$Q^{-1}\varepsilon \lesssim \tau(V) \lesssim Q\varepsilon^{-1}.$$

Proof of Lemma 4 (quantitative ellipse lemma for B) Let $V \in \mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon$. We have already seen in Lemma 2 that

$$\mathrm{d}_V^2 B(V) \geqslant \frac{2}{Q}|\mathrm{d}x||\mathrm{d}y|.$$

The ellipse lemma [14] implies the existence of $\tau(V)$ such that for all vectors $\mathrm{d}x$ and $\mathrm{d}y$ there holds

$$Q\mathrm{d}_V^2 B(V) \geqslant \tau(V)|\mathrm{d}x|^2 + (\tau(V))^{-1}|\mathrm{d}y|^2.$$

We can estimate $\tau(V)$ by testing the Hessian on any $\mathrm{d}V$ of the form $\mathrm{d}V = (\mathrm{d}x, 0, 0, 0)$,

$$\tau(V)|\mathrm{d}x|^2 \leqslant Q(\mathrm{d}_V^2 B(V)\mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) = Q(\partial_x^2 B(V)\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}x) \lesssim Q\varepsilon^{-1}|\mathrm{d}x|^2$$

where the last inequality follows from (5). Hence $\tau(V) \lesssim Q\varepsilon^{-1}$ as claimed. The same bound holds for $(\tau(V)^{-1})$ by testing against $\mathrm{d}V = (0, \mathrm{d}y, 0, 0)$. Finally, we have proved that for all $V \in \mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon$,

$$Q^{-1}\varepsilon \lesssim \tau(V) \lesssim Q\varepsilon^{-1}.$$

□

We now address the lack of smoothness of B. All functions aside from H_4 that appear are at least in $\mathcal{C}^2$. We apply a standard mollifying procedure via convolution with φ_ℓ directly on $H_4(x, y, r, s, K)$, now only

taking *real* variables with x, y positive, $1 < rs < Q$ and $0 < K < 1$. Here φ denotes a standard mollifying kernel in the five real variables $(x, y, r, s, K) \in \mathbb{R}^5$ with support in the corresponding unit ball, whereas $\varphi_\ell(\cdot) := \ell^{-5}\varphi(\cdot/\ell)$ denotes its scaled version with support of size ℓ. By slightly changing the constructions, the upper and lower estimate on the product rs can be modified at the cost of a multiplicative constant in the final estimate of the Bellman function. Also take into account that the weights are cut, therefore bounded above and below. Further, we will assume that the positive variables x and y be bounded below. These considerations give us enough room to smooth the function H_4. It is important that H_4 is at least in $\mathcal{C}^1$ and its second order partial derivatives exist almost everywhere. So we have $\mathrm{d}^2(H_4 * \varphi_\ell) = (\mathrm{d}^2 H_4) * \varphi_\ell$. Last, we are observing that as long as the norms of vectors $|x|$ and $|y|$ are bounded away from 0, our function $H_4 * \varphi_\ell$, mollified in $\mathbb{R}^5$ remains smooth when taking vector variables (observe that the final Bellman function only depends upon $|x|$ and $|y|$). It is important that the smoothing happens before the function is composed with K, we therefore preserve fine convexity properties, in particular also the much needed one-leg convexity. Size estimates change slightly, but are recovered when the mollifying parameter goes to 0. These details are either standard and have appeared in numerous articles on Bellman functions or an easy consequence of reading the construction of the Bellman function above.

Lemma 5 (regularised Bellman function and its properties)**.** *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ given. Let $0 < \ell \leqslant \varepsilon/2$. There exists a function $B_\ell(x, y, r, s)$ defined with domain*

$$\mathcal{D}_Q^{\varepsilon,\ell} := \left\{ V \in \mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon; \quad |x| \geqslant \ell, |y| \geqslant \ell \right\} \subset \mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon$$

such that for all $V_0, V \in \mathcal{D}_Q^{\varepsilon,\ell}$, we have

$$B_\ell \lesssim (1+\ell)\left(\frac{|x|^2}{r} + \frac{|y|^2}{s}\right),$$

$$\mathrm{d}_V^2 B_\ell(V) \geqslant \frac{2}{Q}|\mathrm{d}x||\mathrm{d}y|, \tag{6}$$

(7)

$$B_\ell(V) - B_\ell(V_0) - \mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V_0)(V - V_0) \geqslant \frac{1}{Q}|\Delta x||\Delta y| = \frac{1}{Q}|x - x_0||y - y_0|$$

and moreover the quantitative ellipse lemma now holds in the form

$$\begin{aligned} & Q\mathrm{d}_V^2 B_\ell(V) \\ \geqslant \;& \tau_\ell(V)|\mathrm{d}x|^2 + (\tau_\ell(V))^{-1}|\mathrm{d}y|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_\ell := \tau_\ell(V)$ is a continuous function of its arguments, and where

$$Q^{-1}\varepsilon \lesssim \tau_\ell(V) \lesssim Q\varepsilon^{-1}.$$

4. Dissipation estimates

Let $V := (X, Z, u, w)$ a càdlàg adapted martingale with values in $\mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon$. In order to bound away from the $\mathbb{H}$–valued martingale $X := (X^1, X^2, \ldots)$, it is classical to introduce the $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{H}$–valued martingales $X^a := (a, X^1, X^2, \ldots)$ where $a > 0$. It follows that $\|X^a\|^2 = \|X\|^2 + a^2$ and $\|X^a\| \geqslant a$, and the same construction holds for Z. We note $V^a := (X^a, Z^a, u, w)$ Given $\ell > 0$ a smoothing parameter, take $a \geqslant \ell$ then it follows that

$$V \in \mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon \Rightarrow V^a \in \mathcal{D}_Q^{\varepsilon,\ell}.$$

The main result of this section is the following dissipation estimate:

Proposition 2 (dissipation estimate)**.** *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $\ell > 0$ as defined above. Let V a càdlàg adapted martingale with $V \in \mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon$. Let $F_t := \mathbb{E}(|X_\infty|^2 w_\infty^\varepsilon|\mathcal{F}_t)$ and $G_t := \mathbb{E}(|Z_\infty|^2 u_\infty^\varepsilon|\mathcal{F}_t)$. Let finally $a \geqslant \ell$. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} & Q(1+\ell)(\mathbb{E}F_t + \mathbb{E}G_t + 2a^2\varepsilon^{-1}) \\ \gtrsim\ & \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \tau_\ell(V_{s-})\mathrm{d}[X,X]_s^c + (\tau_\ell(V_{s-}))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[Z,Z]_s^c \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s\leqslant t} |\Delta X_s||\Delta Z_s|. \end{aligned}$$

We need the preliminary lemma

Lemma 6 (comparison of quadratic forms in stochastic integrals)**.** *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ denote the set of quadratic forms from $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $A := (A_{\alpha\beta})_{1\leqslant\alpha,\beta\leqslant m}$ and $B := (B_{\alpha\beta})_{1\leqslant\alpha,\beta\leqslant m}$ two $\mathcal{Q}$–valued càdlàg processes. Assume for all $t \geqslant 0$ and a.s. that $A(t) \geqslant B(t)$ (resp. $A(t) \geqslant |B(t)|$), in the sense $\forall \mathrm{d}V \in \mathbb{R}^m$,*

$$(A\mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant (B\mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \quad (\mathrm{resp}.(A\mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V) \geqslant |(B\mathrm{d}V, \mathrm{d}V)|).$$

Abbreviating $A_{s-} : \mathrm{d}[V,V]_s = \sum_{\alpha,\beta}(A_{\alpha\beta})_{s-}\mathrm{d}[V_\alpha, V_\beta]_s$ then for all $t \geqslant 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^t A_{s-} : \mathrm{d}[V,V]_s \geqslant \mathbb{E}\int_0^t B_{s-} : \mathrm{d}[V,V]_s,$$

$$\left(\mathrm{resp}.\mathbb{E}\int_0^t A_{s-} : \mathrm{d}[V,V]_s \geqslant \mathbb{E}\int_0^t |B_{s-} : \mathrm{d}[V,V]_s|\right).$$

Proof of Lemma 6 (comparison of quadratic forms in stochastic integrals) With the hypotheses above, let us consider the case $A(t) \geqslant B(t)$, the case $A(t) \geqslant |B(t)|$ being treated in the same manner. Given $t \geqslant 0$, assume that

$$\int_0^t A_{s-} : \mathrm{d}[V,V]_s = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \int_0^t (A_{\alpha\beta})_{s-} \mathrm{d}[V_\alpha, V_\beta]_s < \infty$$

otherwise the claim is proved. Given the process V, let $\sigma_n := (0 \leqslant T_0^n \leqslant T_1^n \leqslant \ldots \leqslant T_i^n \leqslant \ldots \leqslant T_{k_n}^n \leqslant t)$ denote a random partition of stopping times tending to the identity as n tends to infinity. Given α and β, we have that $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is a $\mathbb{R}$–valued càdlàg process. It follows (see e.g. Protter [28]) that the stochastic integral

$$\int_0^t A_{\alpha\beta}(s-) \mathrm{d}[V_\alpha, V_\beta]_s \tag{8}$$

is the limit in *ucp* (uniform convergence in probability) as n tends to infinity of sums

$$S_{\alpha\beta}^A := \sum_{i=0}^{k_n-1} A_{\alpha\beta}(T_i^n)(V_\alpha^{T_{i+1}^n} - V_\alpha^{T_i^n})(V_\beta^{T_{i+1}^n} - V_\beta^{T_i^n})$$

involving the stopping times defined above. Since $A \geqslant B$, summing w.r.t. α, β yields, for any $s \in [0,t]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{\alpha,\beta} S_{\alpha\beta}^A\right)(s) &:= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \sum_{i=0}^{k_n-1} A_{\alpha\beta}(T_i^n)(V_{\alpha,s}^{T_{i+1}^n} - V_{\alpha,s}^{T_i^n})(V_{\beta,s}^{T_{i+1}^n} - V_{\beta,s}^{T_i^n}) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{k_n-1} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} A_{\alpha\beta}(T_i^n)(V_{\alpha,s}^{T_{i+1}^n} - V_{\alpha,s}^{T_i^n})(V_{\beta,s}^{T_{i+1}^n} - V_{\beta,s}^{T_i^n}) \\
&\geqslant \sum_{i=0}^{k_n-1} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} B_{\alpha\beta}(T_i^n)(V_{\alpha,s}^{T_{i+1}^n} - V_{\alpha,s}^{T_i^n})(V_{\beta,s}^{T_{i+1}^n} - V_{\beta,s}^{T_i^n}) \\
&\geqslant \left(\sum_{\alpha,\beta} S_{\alpha\beta}^B\right)(s)
\end{aligned}$$

with an obvious definition for $S_{\alpha\beta}^B$. Passing to the limit in the sums $\sum_{\alpha,\beta}$ gives the result. □

Proof of Proposition 2 (dissipation estimates)

Step 1. We first pas to a finite dimensional case. Let V a càdlàg adapted martingale with $V \in \mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon$. Then $V^a \in \mathcal{D}_Q^{\varepsilon,\ell}$. We note $X^{a,m}$ the projection of $X^a \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{H}$ onto $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^m$, and introduce accordingly $Z^{a,m}$ and $V^{a,m}$. Notice that $[X^a,X^a] = a^2 + [X,X]$ and similarly $[X^{a,m},X^{a,m}] = a^2 + [X^m,X^m]$. Since $V^{a,m} \in \mathcal{D}_Q^{\varepsilon,\ell}$ where B_ℓ is $\mathcal{C}^2$ and we can apply Itô's formula and obtain, for all $t>0$, almost sure paths,

$$\begin{aligned} & B_\ell(V_t^{a,m}) \\ = \; & B_\ell(V_0^{a,m}) + \int_{0+}^t \mathrm{d}_V B(V_{s-}^{a,m})\mathrm{d}V_s^m + \frac{1}{2}\int_{0+}^t \mathrm{d}_V^2 B_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m}) : \mathrm{d}[V^m,V^m]_s^c \\ & + \sum_{0<s\leqslant t}\{B_\ell(V_s^{a,m}) - B_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m}) - \mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m})\Delta V_s^m\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 4 and Lemma 6, the concavity properties (6) of B_ℓ imply for the continuous part

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}\int_{0+}^t \mathrm{d}_V^2 B_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m}) : \mathrm{d}[V^m,V^m]_s^c \\ \geqslant \; & \frac{1}{2Q}\int_{0+}^t \tau_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m})\mathrm{d}[X^m,X^m]_s^c + (\tau_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m}))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[Z^m,Z^m]_s^c. \end{aligned}$$

Also, the concavity properties (7) of B_ℓ for the jump part

$$B_\ell(V_s^{a,m}) - B_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m}) - \mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m})\Delta V_s^m \geqslant \frac{1}{Q}|\Delta X_s^m||\Delta Z_s^m|.$$

Plugging the continuous and jump dissipation estimates into Itô's formula yields for all times, almost sure paths,

$$\begin{aligned} B_\ell(V_t^{a,m}) \; \geqslant \; & B_\ell(V_0^{a,m}) + \int_{0+}^t \mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m})\mathrm{d}V_s^m \\ & + \frac{1}{2Q}\int_0^t \tau_\ell(V_{s-}^{a,m})\mathrm{d}[X^m,X^m]_s^c + (\tau_\ell(V_{s-}^m))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[Z^m,Z^m]_s^c \\ & + \frac{1}{Q}\sum_{0<s\leqslant t}|\Delta X_s^m||\Delta Z_s^m|. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. For technical reasons in the proof, we work with bounded martingales that we obtain through a usual stopping procedure. Recall that V is a càdlàg adapted martingale with $V \in \mathcal{D}_Q^\varepsilon$ and $V^a \in \mathcal{D}_Q^{\varepsilon,\ell}$. For all $M \in \mathbb{N}$, define the stopping time T_M as $T_M := \inf\{t > 0; |V^a|_t^2 + [V^a,V^a]_t > M^2\}$, so that T_M is a stopping time that tends to infinity as M goes to infinity. It follows that V^{a,T_M} is a local martingale, and that V^{a,T_M-} and $[V^a,V^a]^{T_M-}$ are bounded semimartingales. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}^\star$ and $V^{a,m}$ the projection of V^a onto $\mathbb{R}^m \subset \mathbb{H}$. For

each M, there exists a sequence $\{T_{M,k}\}_{k\geqslant 1}$ of stopping times such that $T_{M,k} \uparrow T_M$ as $k \uparrow \infty$, and such that $(V^{a,m})^{T_{M,k}}$ is a martingale. Since $|V^{a,m}| \leqslant |V^a|$, it follows that $(V^{a,m})^{T_{M,k}-}$ is a bounded semimartingale, to which we can apply the dissipation estimate of Step 1 above and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& B_\ell(V^{a,m}_{t\wedge T_{M,k}-}) \\
\geqslant\ & B_\ell(V_0^{a,m}) + \int_{0+}^{t\wedge T_{M,k}-} \mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-})\mathrm{d}V^m_s \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2Q}\int_0^{t\wedge T_{M,k}-} \tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-})\mathrm{d}[X^m,X^m]^c_s + (\tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-}))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[Z^m,Z^m]^c_s \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{Q}\sum_{0<s<t\wedge T_{M,k}} |\Delta X^m_s||\Delta Z^m_s| \\
=\ & B_\ell(V_0^{a,m}) + \int_{0+}^{t\wedge T_{M,k}} \mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-})\mathrm{d}V^m_s \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2Q}\int_0^{t\wedge T_{M,k}-} \tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-})\mathrm{d}[X^m,X^m]^c_s + (\tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-}))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[Z^m,Z^m]^c_s \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{Q}\sum_{0<s<t\wedge T_{M,k}} |\Delta X^m_s||\Delta Z^m_s| - \mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V^{a,m}_{t\wedge T_{M,k}-})\Delta V^m_{t\wedge T_{M,k}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation and then letting $k \to \infty$, the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(9)\quad & \mathbb{E}B_\ell(V^{a,m}_{t\wedge T_M-}) \\
\geqslant\ & \mathbb{E}B_\ell(V_0^{a,m}) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2Q}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} \tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-})\mathrm{d}[X^m,X^m]^c_s + (\tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-}))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[Z^m,Z^m]^c_s \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{Q}\mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s<t\wedge T_M} |\Delta X^m_s||\Delta Z^m_s| - \mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V^{a,m}_{t\wedge T_M-})\Delta V^m_{t\wedge T_M}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that we used size properties of B_ℓ, the definition of the stopping time $T_{M,k}$, the estimate of the τ_ℓ provided by Lemma 5 and the size control of the weights.

Step 3. Now, we wish to return to the infinite dimensional case. First recall that $0 \leqslant B_\ell(V) \lesssim (1+\ell)(X^2/u + Y^2/w)$.

Let $F_t := \mathbb{E}(|X_\infty|^2 w_\infty|\mathcal{F}_t)$, $G_t := \mathbb{E}(|Z_\infty|^2 u_\infty|\mathcal{F}_t)$ as well as $F^a_t := \mathbb{E}(|X^a_\infty|^2 w_\infty|\mathcal{F}_t)$, $G^a_t := \mathbb{E}(|Z^a_\infty|^2 u_\infty|\mathcal{F}_t)$. Notice that $F^a_t = \mathbb{E}((|X_\infty|^2 + a^2)w_\infty|\mathcal{F}_t) \leqslant F_t + \mathbb{E}(a^2 w^\varepsilon_\infty|\mathcal{F}_t) \leqslant F_t + a^2\varepsilon^{-1}$. It follows, thanks to

Jensen inequality, that

$$B_\ell(V_t^a) \leqslant C_0(1+\ell)(F_t^a + G_t^a) \lesssim (1+\ell)(F_t + G_t + 2a^2\varepsilon^{-1})$$

A similar inequality holds for $V^{a,m}$ and in particular

$$B_\ell(V^{a,m}_{t\wedge T_M-}) \;\lesssim\; (1+\ell)(F_{t\wedge T_M-} + G_{t\wedge T_M-} + 2a^2\varepsilon^{-1}).$$

Hence, the dominated convergence theorem implies that $\mathbb{E}B_\ell(V^{a,m}_{t\wedge T_M-})$ converges when m goes to infinity towards $\mathbb{E}B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M-})$.

Let us consider the first term in the last integral of step 2, the second term integral in inequality (9). We write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} \tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-})\mathrm{d}[X^m,X^m]^c_s \\
=\;& \mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} \tau_\ell(V^{a}_{s-})\mathrm{d}[X,X]^c_s \\
&\quad +\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} (\tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-}) - \tau_\ell(V^{a}_{s-}))\mathrm{d}[X,X]^c_s \\
&\quad +\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} \tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-})\mathrm{d}([X^m,X^m]^c - [X,X]^c)_s.
\end{aligned}$$

The uniform boundedness and continuity of τ_ℓ, the square integrability of X and the Dominated convergence theorem imply that the second term of the right–hand–side converges to zero. The last term can be bounded above using the estimates for τ_ℓ.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} \tau_\ell(V^{a,m}_{s-})\mathrm{d}([X^m,X^m]^c - [X,X]^c)_s\right| \\
\lesssim\;& \frac{Q}{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} |\mathrm{d}([X^m,X^m]^c - [X,X]^c)_s| \\
\lesssim\;& \frac{Q}{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} \mathrm{d}([X,X]^c - [X^m,X^m]^c)_s \\
\lesssim\;& \frac{Q}{\varepsilon}(\mathbb{E}[X,X]^c_{t\wedge T_M} - \mathbb{E}[X^m,X^m]^c_{t\wedge T_M})
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that for m fixed, $[X,X]^c - [X^m,X^m]^c$ is a nonnegative nondecreasing process. The last expression in the last line tends to zero when $m\to\infty$ by the monotone convergence theorem. We prove in a similar manner the convergence

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s<t\wedge T_M} |\Delta X^m_s||\Delta Z^m_s| \xrightarrow[m\to\infty]{} \mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s<t\wedge T_M} |\Delta X_s||\Delta Z_s|.$$

Finally, since $|V^{a,m}_{t\wedge T_M-}| \leqslant |V^a_{t\wedge T_M-}|$ for all m, $\mathrm{d}_V B_\ell$ is continuous and bounded on compacts, $|\Delta V^m_{t\wedge T_M}|^2 \leqslant |\Delta V_{t\wedge T_M}|^2 \leqslant [V,V]_t$ and $\mathbb{E}[V,V]_t = \mathbb{E}|V_t|^2 < \infty$, the dominated convergence theorem ensures that

$$-\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V^{a,m}_{t\wedge T_M-})\Delta V^m_{t\wedge T_M}\} \to -\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M-})\Delta V_{t\wedge T_M}\}.$$

Collecting all terms,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M-}) \\ \geqslant\ & \frac{1}{2Q}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} \tau_\ell(V^a_{s-})\mathrm{d}[X,X]^c_s + (\tau_\ell(V^a_{s-}))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[Z,Z]^c_s \\ & +\frac{1}{Q}\mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s<t\wedge T_M} |\Delta X_s||\Delta Z_s| \\ & -\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M-})\Delta V_{t\wedge T_M}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 4. Now we add the contribution of the possible jumps occuring at T_M. We have seen in Step 1 the dissipation estimate along one jump

$$\begin{aligned} & B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M}) - B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M-}) - \mathrm{d}_V B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M-})\Delta V_{t\wedge T_M} \\ \geqslant\ & \frac{1}{Q}|\Delta X_{t\wedge T_M}||\Delta Z_{t\wedge T_M}|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation and adding the contribution of Step 3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M}) \ \geqslant\ & \frac{1}{2Q}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge T_M} \tau_\ell(V^a_{s-})\mathrm{d}[X,X]^c_s + (\tau_\ell(V^a_{s-}))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[Z,Z]^c_s \\ & +\frac{1}{Q}\mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s\leqslant t\wedge T_M} |\Delta X_s||\Delta Z_s|. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Step 5. We will pass to the limit $M \to \infty$. Recall again that $0 \leqslant B_\ell(V) \lesssim (1+\ell)(X^2/u + Y^2/w)$. Using Doob's inequality for square integrable martingales, we have for all M

$$\mathbb{E}B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M}) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}(1+\ell)(\mathbb{E}X^2 + \mathbb{E}Y^2) < \infty.$$

So, by the dominated convergence theorem, $\mathbb{E}B_\ell(V^a_{t\wedge T_M}) \to \mathbb{E}B_\ell(V^a_t)$ as $M \to \infty$. The monotone convergence theorem for the integral in the right–hand–side of the inequality (10) therefore yields in the limit

$M \to \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} & (1+\ell)(\mathbb{E}F_t + \mathbb{E}G_t + 2a^2\varepsilon^{-1}) \\ \geqslant\ & \mathbb{E}B_\ell(V_t^a) \\ \gtrsim\ & \frac{1}{2Q}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \tau_\ell(V_{s-}^a)\mathrm{d}[X,X]_s^c + (\tau_\ell(V_{s-}^a))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[Z,Z]_s^c \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{Q}\mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s\leqslant t}|\Delta X_s||\Delta Z_s|. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 2.

□

5. Truncation of the weights

Due to several technicalities in the proof, we have used weights bounded from above and away from 0. In order to pass to the general case, we cut a possibly unbounded weight above and below and show that this operation does not increase the charateristic of the weight. This is convenient and has been used in several places, here we extend [29] to the martingale setting. Their proof is particularly nice, since it does not increase the characteristic at all, not even by a constant. We need the following preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 7 (truncation from above)**.** *For $a > 0$ let $M = \{w \leqslant a\}$ and $H = \{w > a\}$. Now take $w_{\bar{a}} = w\chi_M + a\chi_H$. Then $Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w_{\bar{a}}] \leqslant Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]$.*

Proof of Lemma 7 Let τ be a stopping time and let us decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau) &= \mathbb{E}(w\chi_M|\mathcal{F}_\tau) + \mathbb{E}(w\chi_H|\mathcal{F}_\tau) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\chi_M|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}_M(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau) + \mathbb{E}(\chi_H|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}_H(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau) \end{aligned}$$

where for example $\mathbb{E}_M(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)$ means expectation is taken with respect to the measure $\chi_M \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}$. Write as usual $\mathbb{E}(\chi_M|\mathcal{F}_\tau) = (\chi_M)_\tau$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau) - \mathbb{E}(w_{\bar{a}}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}(w_{\bar{a}}^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau) \\ =\ & ((\chi_M)_\tau\mathbb{E}_L(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau) + (\chi_H)_\tau\mathbb{E}_H(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau))((\chi_M)_\tau\mathbb{E}_L(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau) \\ & \quad + (\chi_H)_\tau\mathbb{E}_H(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)) - ((\chi_M)_\tau\mathbb{E}_L(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau) \\ & \quad + (\chi_H)_\tau a)((\chi_M)_\tau\mathbb{E}_L(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau) + (\chi_H)_\tau a^{-1}) \\ =\ & (\chi_M)_\tau(\chi_H)_\tau\big(\mathbb{E}_M(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}_H(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau) + \mathbb{E}_M(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}_H(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau) \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}_M(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)a^{-1} - \mathbb{E}_M(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)a\big) \\ & \quad + (\chi_H)_\tau^2(\mathbb{E}_H(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}_H(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

The last term is positive thanks to Jensen inequality. Let us observe that also

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_M(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}_H(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)+\mathbb{E}_M(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}_H(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\\
&\qquad -\mathbb{E}_M(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)a^{-1}-\mathbb{E}_M(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)a\\
=\;&\mathbb{E}_M(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}_H(w^{-1}-a^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)+\mathbb{E}_M(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\mathbb{E}_H(w-a|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\\
=\;&\mathbb{E}_H\left(\frac{w-a}{wa}(wa\mathbb{E}_M(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)-\mathbb{E}_M(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau))\middle|\mathcal{F}_\tau\right)\\
\geqslant\;&0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality uses $\mathbb{E}_M(w^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\geqslant a^{-1}$ and $\mathbb{E}_M(w|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\leqslant a$ also $w-a\geqslant 0$ on H. This proves the Lemma. □

Lemma 8 (two-sided truncation)**.** *For $a>0$ let $M=\{a^{-1}\leqslant w\leqslant a\}$ and $L=\{w<a^{-1}\}$ and $H=\{w>a\}$ then with $w_a=a^{-1}\chi_L+w\chi_M+a\chi_H$ we have $Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w_a]\leqslant Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]$.*

Proof of Lemma 8 Let $w_{\bar{a}}$ be the weight obtained in the previous lemma. Apply now the previous lemma to $w_{\bar{a}}^{-1}$, truncating above by the same a. □

6. Proof of the main results

Proof of Proposition 1 (bilinear estimate) Let $\lambda>0$. Let Y differentially subordinate to X, then λY is differentially subordinate to λX. Let w a weight in the $\boldsymbol{A}_2$ class. Let w^ε the ε–truncation of w. Using Proposition 2 with $V^{\varepsilon,\lambda}:=(\lambda X,\lambda^{-1}Z,u^\varepsilon,w^\varepsilon)$ and $Q=Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]$. Notice that since $Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w^\varepsilon]\leqslant Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]$, $V^{\varepsilon,\lambda}\in\mathcal{D}_Q^{\varepsilon,\ell}$ using the differential subordination of λY w.r.t. λX, we have for all $t>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w](1+\ell)(\mathbb{E}\lambda^2F_t+\mathbb{E}\lambda^{-2}G_t+2a^2\varepsilon^{-1})\\
\gtrsim\;&\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\tau_\ell(V_{s-}^a)\mathrm{d}[\lambda X,\lambda X]_s^c+(\tau_\ell(V_{s-}^a))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[\lambda^{-1}Z,\lambda^{-1}Z]_s^c\\
&\qquad+\mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s\leqslant t}|\lambda\Delta X_s||\lambda^{-1}\Delta Z_s|\\
\gtrsim\;&\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\tau_\ell(V_{s-}^a)\mathrm{d}[\lambda Y,\lambda Y]_s^c+(\tau_\ell(V_{s-}))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[\lambda^{-1}Z,\lambda^{-1}Z]_s^c\\
&\qquad+\mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s\leqslant t}|\Delta Y_s||\Delta Z_s|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since for any $0 < \kappa < \infty$ and any $x \in \mathbb{H}$, $y \in \mathbb{H}$, we have $\kappa x^2 + \kappa^{-1} y^2 \geqslant 2|\langle x, y\rangle|$, it follows easily

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \tau_\ell(V_{s-})\mathrm{d}[\lambda Y, \lambda Y]^c_s + (\tau_\ell(V_{s-}))^{-1}\mathrm{d}[\lambda^{-1}Z, \lambda^{-1}Z]^c_s \\ & \qquad + \mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s\leqslant t} |\Delta Y_s||\Delta Z_s| \\ \geqslant\ & \mathbb{E}\int_0^t |\mathrm{d}[\lambda Y, \lambda^{-1}Z]^c_s| + \mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s\leqslant t} |\Delta Y_s||\Delta Z_s| \\ \geqslant\ & \mathbb{E}\int_0^t |\mathrm{d}[Y, Z]^c_s| + \mathbb{E}\sum_{0<s\leqslant t} |\Delta Y_s||\Delta Z_s| \\ \geqslant\ & \mathbb{E}\int_0^t |\mathrm{d}[Y, Z]_s| \end{aligned}$$

where all integrals and sums converge. Hence for all $\lambda > 0$

$$Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w](1+\ell)(\lambda^2 \mathbb{E}F_t + \lambda^{-2}\mathbb{E}G_t + 2a^2\varepsilon^{-1}) \gtrsim \mathbb{E}\int_0^t |\mathrm{d}[Y, Z]_s|.$$

We let now successively $\ell \to 0$ then $a \to 0$. Choosing specific $\lambda^2 = (\mathbb{E}G_t)^{1/2}(\mathbb{E}F_t)^{-1/2}$, we can assume $\lambda > 0$ (otherwise the claim is trivial), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^t |\mathrm{d}[Y, Z]_s| \lesssim Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w](\mathbb{E}F_t)^{1/2}(\mathbb{E}G_t)^{1/2} \lesssim Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]\|X\|_{2,w^\varepsilon}\|Z\|_{2,u^\varepsilon}.$$

The inequality above remains valid in the limit $t \to \infty$. Since the left–hand–side does not depend on the truncation of the weight, it remains to observe that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\|X\|_{2,w^\varepsilon} = \|X\|_{2,w} \quad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\|Z\|_{2,u^\varepsilon} = \|Z\|_{2,u}.$$

Indeed, since $X \in L^2(\Omega; \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}) \cap L^2(\Omega; \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}^w)$, we have for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, a.s. $X_\infty^2 w_\infty^\varepsilon \leqslant X_\infty^2 + X_\infty^2 w_\infty$ and the limits above are a consequence of the dominated convergence theorem. The same reasoning applied to Z completes the proof of the bilinear embedding. □

Proof of Theorem 1 (differential subordination under change of law) The proof of the main result is now straightforward since the Proposition above allows us to estimate, for any test function $Z_\infty \in L^2(\Omega, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}) \cap L^2(\Omega, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}^u)$,

$$|(Y_\infty, Z_\infty)| \ = \ \left|\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}[Y, Z]_s\right| \leqslant \int_0^\infty |\mathrm{d}[Y, Z]_s| \lesssim Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]\|X\|_{2,w}\|Z\|_{2,u},$$

that is exactly

$$\|Y\|_{2,w} \lesssim Q_2^{\mathcal{F}}[w]\|X\|_{2,w}.$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1. □

7. Sharpness and applications

7.1. **Sharpness.**

Sharpness means that he linear power in the martingale A_2 characteristic cannot be improved.

7.1.1. *discrete time.* That the result is sharp in the dyadic, discrete–in–time filtration case is well known and follows from the sharpness of the linear estimate for the dyadic square function in this setting (see [16] for an explicit calculation). Notice that the norm of the square function is no larger than that of a predictable dyadic multiplier - given the dyadic square function is obtained by taking expectation of a $\sigma = \pm 1$ predictable multiplier T_σ. Indeed $Sf^2(t) = \mathbb{E}|T_\sigma f(t)|^2$, see for example [26].

7.1.2. *continuous time.* To see an example with continuous–in–time filtration, see [12] for details, we briefly summarize the flow of the argument. Let $f(x)$ a compactly supported integrable function, defined on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{f}(z) = \tilde{f}(x, y)$ its harmonic extension to the upper half space. Let $W_t = (x_t, y_t)$ be background noise (see [15]), that is in a limiting sense a two-dimensional Brownian motion starting at ∞ and arriving on the x axis. Then the martingales

$$M_t^{\tilde{f}} = \tilde{f}(W_t) \text{ and } M_t^{\widetilde{Hf}} = \widetilde{Hf}(W_t)$$

(H the Hilbert transform) are a pair of differentially subordinate martingales that cannot have sublinear growth in weighted space with respect to the A_2 characteristic of the induced filtration. To see this, use the formula by Gundy–Varopoulos [15] restricted to the Hilbert transform. By Cauchy–Riemann relations one passes to a martingale representation that does not require conditioning by arrival, such as written in the Riesz transform case in [15]. Then the authors in [12] borrowed the explicit examples that show the correct growth of the Hilbert transform using the Poisson characteristic for $1 < p < 2$ and passed to $p = 2$ through an extrapolation argument using the martingale setting through an argument by contradiction. Further, it is easy

to see that the deterministic Poisson A_2 characteristic and the martingale A_2 characteristic driven by background noise are comparable.

7.2. **Applications.**

7.2.1. *Discrete–in–time predictable multipliers.* The Bellman function in this paper and in particular its one-leg convexity can give a direct proof of the results in [20] and [30], a weighted estimate for predictable multipliers in the case of discrete in time filtrations.

7.2.2. *Dimension–free weighted bounds on discrete operators.* Through the recent stochastic integral formula for second order Riesz transforms [1] on compact multiply-connected Lie groups $\mathbb{G}$, our result gives dimension–free weighted L^2 estimates in this setting too, using the semi-discrete heat characteristic of the weight. The second order Riesz transforms take the form

$$R_\alpha^2 = \sum_i \alpha_i R_i^2 + \sum_{j,k} \alpha_{ij} R_{ij}^2,$$

where the first diagonal sum are second order Riesz transforms in discrete directions of the space and the second sum are continuous second order Riesz transforms on the connected part, see [1] for more precise definitions. The process considered is deterministic in one variable and is Brownian in continuous directions together with a compound Poisson jump process in the other, discontinuous directions. It was proved in [1] that $R_\alpha^2 f(z)$ can be written as the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}(M_0^{\alpha,f}|Z_0 = z)$ where $M_t^{\alpha,f}$ is a martingale transform of M_t^f associated to f and Z_t a suitable random walk. One obtains the estimate

$$\|R_\alpha f\|_{L^2(w)} \lesssim Q_2(w)\|f\|_{L^2(w)} \tag{11}$$

with implied constant independent of dimension and $Q_2(w)$ the semi discrete heat characteristic. An important special case are the second order discrete Riesz transforms on products of integers. Notice that both the continuous–in–time filtrations and the consideration of jump processes are important to get this estimate.

It is also possible to get a deterministic proof of this application (11), using the Bellman function we construct in this paper in combination with part of the proof strategy in [10]. Notice though, that the trick used in [10] to overcome the difficulty of the jumps, does not work in the weighted setting, due to non-convexity of the domain of the Bellman function. For a deterministic Bellman proof to give the weighted

estimate (11), it is instrumental to have the one-leg convexity property we proved here.

7.2.3. *Probabilistic proof for estimate of the weighted Beurling operator.* Our result gives a probabilistic proof of the weighted estimate for the Beurling–Ahlfors transform that solved a famous borderline regularity problem in [27] previously proved by Bellman functions and other means. To see this, one invokes the stochastic integral identity formula [4] for the Beurling-Ahlfors operator using heat flow martingales. The comparability of heat flow A_2 characteristic and martingale characteristic obtained when using the filtration in [4] is not hard to see. In turn, in [27] it was seen that the heat flow characteristic compares linearly to the classical characteristic. The standard extrapolation result for sublinear operators in [13] gives the sharp weighted result in L^p.

7.2.4. *Dimension–free weighted bound, Riemannian setting.* Dahmani [8] used the continuous properties of the Bellman function constructed in this paper to prove a dimensionless weighted bound for the Bakry Riesz vector. Her result gives an optimal estimate in terms of the Poisson characteristic. She considers a large class of manifolds with non–negative Bakry-Emery curvature, such as for example the Gauss space. The explicit expression of the Bellman function is essential to her argument.

—

References

[1] Nicola Arcozzi, Komla Domelevo, and Stefanie Petermichl. Second order Riesz transforms on multiply-connected Lie groups and processes with jumps. *ArXiv e-prints*, 07 2015.

[2] Rodrigo Bañuelos and Adam Osekowski. On the Bellman function of Nazarov, Treil and Volberg. *Math. Z.*, 278(1-2):385–399, 2014.

[3] Rodrigo Bañuelos and Adam Osekowski. Sharp weighted L^2 inequalities for square functions. *ArXiv e-prints*, 03 2016.

[4] Rodrigo Bañuelos and Prabhu Janakiraman. L^p-bounds for the Beurling-Ahlfors transform. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360(7):3603–3612, 2008.

[5] Frédéric Bernicot, Dorothee Frey, and Stefanie Petermichl. Sharp weighted norm estimates beyond Calderón-Zygmund theory. *ArXiv e-prints*, 10 2015.

[6] A. Bonami and D. Lepingle. Fonction maximale et variation quadratique des martingales en présence d'un poids. Séminaire de probabilités XIII, Univ. Strasbourg 1977/78, Lect. Notes Math. 721, 294-306 (1979)., 1979.

[7] D. L. Burkholder. Boundary value problems and sharp inequalities for martingale transforms. *Ann. Probab.*, 12(3):647–702, 1984.

[8] Kamilia Dahmani. Sharp dimension-free weighted bounds for the bakry-riesz vector. *In preparation*, 2016.
[9] Claude Dellacherie and Paul-André Meyer. *Probabilities and potential. B*, volume 72 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1982. Theory of martingales, Translated from the French by J. P. Wilson.
[10] Komla Domelevo and Stefanie Petermichl. Bilinear embeddings on graphs. *preprint*, 2014.
[11] Komla Domelevo and Stefanie Petermichl. Sharp L^p estimates for discrete second order Riesz transforms. *Adv. Math.*, 262:932–952, 2014.
[12] Komla Domelevo, Stefanie Petermichl, and Janine Wittwer. A linear dimensionless bound for the weighted riesz vector. *ArXiv e-prints*, 01 2015.
[13] Oliver Dragičević, Loukas Grafakos, María Cristina Pereyra, and Stefanie Petermichl. Extrapolation and sharp norm estimates for classical operators on weighted Lebesgue spaces. *Publ. Mat.*, 49(1):73–91, 2005.
[14] Oliver Dragičević, Sergei Treil, and Alexander Volberg. A theorem about three quadratic forms. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, pages Art. ID rnn 072, 9, 2008.
[15] Richard F. Gundy and Nicolas Th. Varopoulos. Les transformations de Riesz et les intégrales stochastiques. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 289(1):A13–A16, 1979.
[16] S. Hukovic, S. Treil, and A. Volberg. The Bellman functions and sharp weighted inequalities for square functions. In *Complex analysis, operators, and related topics*, volume 113 of *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.*, pages 97–113. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.
[17] Richard Hunt, Benjamin Muckenhoupt, and Richard Wheeden. Weighted norm inequalities for the conjugate function and Hilbert transform. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 176:227–251, 1973.
[18] Tuomas P. Hytönen. The sharp weighted bound for general Calderón-Zygmund operators. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 175(3):1473–1506, 2012.
[19] M. Izumisawa and N. Kazamaki. Weighted norm inequalities for martingales. *Tôhoku Math. J. (2)*, 29(1):115–124, 1977.
[20] Michael T. Lacey. An elementary proof of the A_2 bound. 01 2015.
[21] Michael T. Lacey, Stefanie Petermichl, and Maria Carmen Reguera. Sharp A_2 inequality for Haar shift operators. *Math. Ann.*, 348(1):127–141, 2010.
[22] Andrei K. Lerner. On pointwise estimates involving sparse operators. *ArXiv e-prints*, 12 2015.
[23] F. Nazarov, S. Treil, and A. Volberg. The Bellman functions and two-weight inequalities for Haar multipliers. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12(4):909–928, 1999.
[24] Adam Osekowski. Sharp L^p-bounds for the martingale maximal function. *to appear in Tohoku Mathematical Journal*, 2016.
[25] S. Petermichl. The sharp bound for the Hilbert transform on weighted Lebesgue spaces in terms of the classical A_p characteristic. *Amer. J. Math.*, 129(5):1355–1375, 2007.
[26] S. Petermichl and S. Pott. An estimate for weighted Hilbert transform via square functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 354(4):1699–1703 (electronic), 2002.

[27] Stefanie Petermichl and Alexander Volberg. Heating of the Ahlfors-Beurling operator: weakly quasiregular maps on the plane are quasiregular. *Duke Math. J.*, 112(2):281–305, 2002.

[28] Philip E. Protter. *Stochastic integration and differential equations*, volume 21 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. Second edition. Version 2.1, Corrected third printing.

[29] Alexander Reznikov, Vasiliy Vasyunin, and Alexander Volberg. An observation: cut-off of the weight w does not increase the a_{p_1,p_2}-"norm" of w. *ArXiv e-prints*, 08 2010.

[30] Christoph Thiele, Sergei Treil, and Alexander Volberg. Weighted martingale multipliers in the non-homogeneous setting and outer measure spaces. *Adv. Math.*, 285:1155–1188, 2015.

[31] Sergei Treil. Sharp A_2 estimates of Haar shifts via Bellman function. In *Recent trends in analysis. Proceedings of the conference in honor of Nikolai Nikolski on the occasion of his 70th birthday, Bordeaux, France, August 31 – September 2, 2011*, pages 187–208. Bucharest: The Theta Foundation, 2013.

[32] Vasily Vasyunin and Alexander Volberg. Burkholder's function via Monge-Ampère equation. *Ill. J. Math.*, 54(4):1393–1428, 2010.

[33] Gang Wang. Differential subordination and strong differential subordination for continuous-time martingales and related sharp inequalities. *Ann. Probab.*, 23(2):522–551, 1995.

[34] Janine Wittwer. A sharp estimate on the norm of the martingale transform. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 7(1):1–12, 2000.

Insitut de Mathématiques de Toulouse. Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France

E-mail address: komla.domelevo@math.univ-toulouse.fr

Insitut de Mathématiques de Toulouse. Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France

E-mail address: stefanie.petermichl@math.univ-toulouse.fr